City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS

Application Number: 3013250

Applicant Name: Craig Belcher

Address of Proposal: 5000 University Way NE

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Land Use Application to allow a 7-story structure with 111 residential units above 16,000 sq. ft. of ground level commercial space. Project also includes parking for 41 vehicles and 30 bicycles located at and below grade, and 2,000 cu. yds. of grading.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review pursuant to Chapter 23.41, Seattle Municipal Code, with Departures:

Development Standard Departure to allow a rear setback less than the required 15' minimum. (SMC 23.47.014.B)
Development Standard Departure to allow a blank façade larger than the 20' maximum. (SMC 23.47A.008.A.2)
Development Standard Departure to allow less transparency of the street facing façade than the 60% minimum. (SMC 23.47A.008.B.2)

SEPA – Environmental Determination – Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code.

SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-Significance

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.

☒ Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.06.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Location: The site is a corner lot at the northeast corner of the intersection of University Way NE and NE 50th Street.

Zoning: Neighborhood Commercial (NC3-65)

Parcel Size: 26,052 square feet.

ECAs: None.

Site Development
The site contains One-story early 20th century commercial buildings, a 3-story mixed use residential and commercial building, and surface parking.

Existing vehicular access is via one curb cut at University Way NE and via the alley.

Surrounding Development and Neighborhood Character
A three-story early 20th century school building, converted to a community center (University Heights Community Center) is located across the street to the west. P-patches are located on the east and south sides of the UHCC building. A future park is planned for the south portion of this site. The University Farmer's Market is held once a week on University Way NE, adjacent to the building. .

A newer one-story building and surface parking lot are located to the north. Early 20th century apartment buildings, ranging from 2-4 stories, are located across the alley to the east.

Across the street to the south are 1-3 story early 20th century buildings with a wide variety of uses. A religious institution and associated services are located across the street to the southeast, and retail, restaurant, and a theater are located directly across the street to the south.

To the southwest across the intersection is a mid-20th century auto-oriented drive-through restaurant with surface parking.

The University of Washington campus is located a few blocks to the southeast. The future light rail station (to open in approximately 2020) is located a few blocks to the south. University Way ("The Ave") borders the west side of this site.

The site is located in the University Urban Center. Urban Centers are intended to be neighborhoods with higher density development, taller structures, and a variety of commercial uses and services near transit. The University Urban Center exhibits many of these characteristics, although some of the parcels are underdeveloped when compared to the zoned heights and intensity of uses. Most of the commercial uses and services are located on the main arterial streets.

The nearby neighborhood is fully developed with sidewalks, but often lacks planting strips and street trees. Transit service is frequent and includes a variety of routes. The future light rail station will further increase the frequency and choice of modes of transit. The nearby streets are heavily used by pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and other vehicles

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The public comment period ended on November 6, 2013. In addition to the comments received through the Design Review process, other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to the location of vehicle access, construction impacts, location of waste storage, façade composition, and the amount of parking. Comments were also received that are beyond the scope of this review and analysis per SMC 23.41 and 25.05.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE December 3, 2012

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (**Error! Reference source not found.**) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at Seattle DCI:

Mailing Address: **Public Resource Center**
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

The proposal includes setbacks at the street and alley to add greater sidewalk width and additional planting areas to the narrow sidewalk and alley. The rooftop of the proposed development would include planting or p-patches to respond to the context of the future park on the UHCC site.

The preferred option includes a stepped west façade. The first step back (above the first floor) would include green roof and green wall areas to screen the second story parking level. The second step (above the second story) would provide area for residential terraces.

The southwest corner retail is proposed as double height glazing to respond to the corner context.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised:

- The small narrow storefronts should be maintained in the new retail spaces, since these provide opportunities for varied retail and restaurant uses. Restaurant uses are encouraged.
- The proposed setbacks are a good addition to the narrow sidewalk and alley.

- The bicycle parking should be designed to provide enough storage area for residents' bicycles, and the storage area should be designed to be flexible over time.
- The alley should be designed to accommodate existing and future levels of pedestrian traffic in the area.
- Trash and recycling storage and staging areas should be recessed and screened.
- The alley and alley entrances should be designed for pedestrian safety and visual interest.
- The curb should be moved further into the street to expand the sidewalk area ("curb bulb").
- The intersection should be designed to increase safety and decrease pedestrian/car accidents.
- The lighting and building design should work to improve safety and security in the area.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE (December 3, 2012):

1. **Architectural Concept:**
    a. The proposed setbacks are a good response to the narrow sidewalks, and the glazed storefront corner is a good response to the corner condition. (A-1, A-2, A-4, A-10, B-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-1, D-11, E-2)
    b. The upper and lower portions of the design should emphasize the corner location and respond to the architectural concept. (A-10, C-2, C-4)
        i. A strong corner design may be challenging at the street level with proposed setback and glazing, but the Board was supportive of the proposed design direction.
    c. Overhead weather protection should be used to create usable sheltered areas for pedestrians at the corner and also create human scale at the corner. (A-3, A-4, A-10, B-1, C-3, D-1)
    d. Building entries will be important to the street level design and should relate to the architectural concept. (A-3, C-2)
    e. Commercial transparency and signage should create visual interest and enhance human activity at the street frontages. (D-2, D-9, D-11)
    f. The proposal should respond to the context of activity in the area, but not necessarily nearby historic architecture. (A-1, C-1, E-3)
        i. The design should respond to the future park across the street, the activity on University Way NE, and other nearby hubs and corridors of activity.
    g. The lighting plan should enhance safety and security at the street frontages. (D-7, D-10)

2. **Above Grade Parking**: The Board noted that the proposed above-grade parking is a concern. The 'dead zone' of the parking floor may detract from human activity at the street level.
    a. Possible solutions include extending the commercial expression up to the second floor, lowering the residential expression down to the second floor, or creating a 'feature' at the second floor. (A-7, A-8, A-9, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-5, E-2)

b. A 'feature' is a more challenging approach to do successfully, but it could be an opportunity for a biophilic design that includes strategies such as interesting lighting and landscaping to respond to the context of the Farmers market and the future park across the street. (A-1, A-4, A-7, C-2, C-3, C-4, E-2, E-3)
c. The context of the future park across the street will result in a view of this parking level for perpetuity. Therefore the design of the west façade and second floor parking is particularly critical. (A-1, A-2, A-9, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-5, E-2, E-3)

3. **Materials:** The Board emphasized that high quality durable materials will be critical on this building, given the prominence of this corner in the University District and the high degree of visibility that will result from the future park.
   a. Brick at the street level with cementitious siding above will not be sufficient for this context, given the permanent "long view" of this site that will be visible across the future park, and the prominence of this corner in the neighborhood and on University Way NE. (A-1, A-2, A-10, B-1, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4)
   b. High quality and finely detailed materials are needed at all levels of this building. (A-1, B-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-2)
   c. The street frontages should be very high quality finely detailed materials. (A-1, A-2, C-2, C-3, C-4, D-2)
   d. The alley façade should be well detailed but the materials can reflect the alley condition rather than the prominence of the street facing facades. (A-1, B-1, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4)

4. **Alley Facade:**
   a. The alley edge should be designed for sufficient vehicle access. The Board noted that the garage access point may be too close to the alley intersection, given the alley grade. (D-5, D-6, D-7, D-8)
   b. The proposal should include sufficient area for trash and recycling storage and staging. The storage area and staging should be screened visually and to minimize odors, given the proximity of residences and pedestrians to the alley façade. (C-2, D-6)
   c. The alley façade should include a pedestrian entry for residents. (D-1, D-8)
   d. The alley façade and street frontage should be designed for access by cyclists. Entries should be designed with overhead weather protection and the entry doors should be designed for easy access for people using bicycles. (D-1, D-7, D-8)
   e. The lighting plan should enhance safety at the alley. (D-7, D-8)

5. **Street level design:**
   a. The Board supports a curb bulb to complement any nearby or proposed curb bulbs to increase pedestrian safety and allow more sidewalk area. The Board noted that curb bulbs are within the purview of Seattle Department of Transportation. (A-2, D-7)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines & Neighborhood specific guidelines (as applicable) of highest priority for this project. The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

A-1 **<u>Responding to Site Characteristics</u>. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The pedestrian-oriented street streetscape is perhaps the most important characteristic to be emphasized in the neighborhood. The University Community identified certain streets as "Mixed Use Corridors". These are streets where commercial and residential uses and activities interface and create a lively, attractive, and safe pedestrian environment. The Mixed Use Corridors are shown in Map 1. Another important site feature in the University Community is the presence of the Burke Gilman Trail. The primary goal is to minimize impacts to views, sunlight and mixed uses while increasing safety and access along the trail.

Guideline: For properties facing the Burke Gilman Trail, new buildings should be located to minimize impacts to views of Mount Rainier, Cascade Mountains and Lake Washington, and allow for sunlight along the trail and increase safety and access for trail users.

A-2 **<u>Streetscape Compatibility</u>. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Reinforcing the pedestrian streetscape and protecting public view corridors are particularly important site planning issues. Stepping back upper floors allows more sunlight to reach the street, minimizes impact to views, and maintains the low- to medium rise character of the streetscape. Roof decks providing open space for mixed- use development can be located facing the street so that upper stories are, in effect, set back.

Guideline - Solar Orientation: Minimizing shadow impacts is important in the University neighborhood. The design of a structure and its massing on the site can enhance solar exposure for the project and minimize shadow impacts onto adjacent public areas between March 21st and September 21st. This is especially important on blocks with narrow rights-of-way relative to other neighborhood streets, including University Way, south of NE 50th Street.

A-3 **<u>Entrances Visible from the Street</u>. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Another way to emphasize human activity and pedestrian orientation, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors, is to provide clearly identifiable storefront entries. In residential projects, walkways and entries promote visual access and security.

Guidelines:

1. **On Mixed Use Corridors, primary business and residential entrances should be oriented to the commercial street.**
2. **In residential projects, except townhouses, it is generally preferable to have one walkway from the street that can serve several building entrances.**
3. **When a courtyard is proposed for a residential project, the courtyard should have at least one entry from the street.**
4. **In residential projects, front yard fences over four (4) feet in height that reduce visual access and security should be avoided.**

A-4 Human Activity. New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Pedestrian orientation and activity should be emphasized in the University Community, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors. While most streets feature narrow sidewalks relative to the volume of pedestrian traffic, wider sidewalks and more small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, and other activities would benefit these areas. Pedestrian-oriented open spaces, such as wider sidewalks and plazas, are encouraged as long as the setback does not detract from the "street wall."

Guidelines: On Mixed Use Corridors, where narrow sidewalks exist (less than 15' wide), consider recessing entries to provide small open spaces for sitting, street musicians, bus waiting, or other pedestrian activities. Recessed entries should promote pedestrian movement and avoid blind corners.

A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: There is a severe lack of both public and private open space in the community. Small open spaces—such as gardens, courtyards, or plazas—that are visible or accessible to the public are an important part of the neighborhood's vision. Therefore, providing ground-level open space is an important public objective and will improve the quality of the residential environment.

Guidelines:

1. **The ground-level open space should be designed as a plaza, courtyard, play area, mini-park, pedestrian open space, garden, or similar occupiable site feature. The quantity of open space is less important than the provision of functional and visual ground-level open space.**
2. **A central courtyard in cottage or townhouse developments may provide better open space than space for each unit. In these cases, yard setbacks may be reduced if a sensitive transition to neighbors is maintained.**

A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: In Lowrise residential developments, single-lane driveways approximately 12 feet in width) are preferred over wide or multiple driveways where feasible.

A-9 **<u>Location of Parking on Commercial Street Fronts</u>. Parking on a commercial street front should be minimized and where possible should be located behind a building.**

A-10 **<u>Corner Lots</u>. Building on corner lots should be oriented to the corner and public street fronts. Parking and automobile access should be located away from corners.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The Citywide Design Guidelines encourage buildings on corner lots to orient to the corner and adjacent street fronts. Within the University Community there are several intersections that serve as "gateways" to the neighborhood.

Guideline: For new buildings located on a corner, including, but not limited to the corner locations identified in Map 3, consider providing special building elements distinguishable from the rest of the building such as a tower, corner articulation or bay windows. Consider a special site feature such as diagonal orientation and entry, a sculpture, a courtyard, or other device. Corner entries should be set back to allow pedestrian flow and good visibility at the intersection.

B-1 **<u>Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility</u>. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The residential areas are experiencing a change from houses to block-like apartments. Also, the proximity of lower intensive zones to higher intensive zones requires special attention to potential impacts of increased height, bulk and scale. These potential impact areas are shown in Map 4 . The design and siting of buildings is critical to maintaining stability and Lowrise character.

Guideline: Special attention should be paid to projects in the following areas to minimize impacts of increased height, bulk and scale as stated in the Citywide Design Guideline.

C-1 **<u>Architectural Context</u>. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: Buildings in the University Community feature a broad range of building types with an equally broad range of architectural character. Because of the area's variety, no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction. As an example, the University of Washington campus sets a general direction in architectural style and preference for masonry and cast stone materials, however, new buildings on and off campus incorporate the general massing and materials of this character, rather than replicating it.

Guidelines:

1. **Although no single architectural style or character emerges as a dominant direction for new construction in the University Community, project applicants should show how the proposed design incorporates elements of the local architectural character especially when there are buildings of local historical significance or landmark status in the vicinity.**
2. **For areas within Ravenna Urban Village, particularly along 25th Avenue NE, the style of architecture is not as important so long as it emphasizes pedestrian orientation and avoids large-scale, standardized and auto-oriented characteristics.**
3. **On Mixed Use Corridors, consider breaking up the façade into modules of not more than 50 feet (measured horizontally parallel to the street) on University Way and 100 feet on other corridors, corresponding to traditional platting and building construction.**
4. **When the defined character of a block, including adjacent or facing blocks, is comprised of historic buildings, or groups of buildings of local historic importance and character, as well as street trees or other significant vegetation (as identified in the 1975 Inventory and subsequent updating), the architectural treatment of new development should respond to this local historical character.**
5. **Buildings in Lowrise zones should provide a "fine-grained" architectural character.**

C-2 **Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.**

C-3 **Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.**

C-4 **Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Guidelines:

1. **New buildings should emphasize durable, attractive, and well-detailed finish materials, including: Brick; Concrete; Cast stone, natural stone, tile; Stucco and stucco-like panels; Art tile; Wood.**
2. **Sculptural cast stone and decorative tile are particularly appropriate because they relate to campus architecture and Art Deco buildings. Wood and cast stone are appropriate for moldings and trim.**
3. **The materials listed below are discouraged and should only be used if they complement the building's architectural character and are architecturally treated for a specific reason that supports the building and streetscape character: Masonry units; Metal siding; Wood siding and shingles; Vinyl siding; Sprayed-on finish; Mirrored glass.**
4. **Where anodized metal is used for window and door trim, then care should be given to the proportion and breakup of glazing to reinforce the building concept and proportions.**

5. **Fencing adjacent to the sidewalk should be sited and designed in an attractive and pedestrian oriented manner.**
6. **Awnings made of translucent material may be backlit, but should not overpower neighboring light schemes. Lights, which direct light downward, mounted from the awning frame are acceptable. Lights that shine from the exterior down on the awning are acceptable.**
7. **Light standards should be compatible with other site design and building elements.**

Signs
Context: The Citywide Design Guidelines do not provide guidance for new signs. New guidelines encourage signs that reinforce the character of the building and the neighborhood.
Guidelines:

1. **The following sign types are encouraged, particularly along Mixed Use Corridors – Pedestrian oriented shingle or blade signs extending from the building front just above pedestrians; Marquee signs and signs on pedestrian canopies; Neon signs; Carefully executed window signs; such as etched glass or hand painted signs; Small signs on awnings or canopies.**
2. **Post mounted signs are discouraged.**
3. **The location and installation of signage should be integrated with the building's architecture.**
4. **Monument signs should be integrated into the development, such as on a screen wall.**

C-5 <u>Structured Parking Entrances</u>. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.

D-1 <u>Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances</u>. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context:
The University Community would like to encourage, especially on Mixed Use Corridors, the provision of usable, small open spaces, such as gardens, courtyards, or plazas that are visible and/or accessible to the public. Therefore, providing ground-level open space is an important public objective and will improve the quality of both the pedestrian and residential environment.

Guidelines:

1. **On Mixed Use Corridors, consider setting back a portion of the building to provide small pedestrian open spaces with seating amenities. The building façades along the open space must still be pedestrian-oriented.**
2. **On Mixed Use Corridors, entries to upper floor residential uses should be accessed from, but not dominate, the street frontage. On corner locations, the main residential entry should be on the side street with a small courtyard that provides a transition between the entry and the street.**

D-2 **Blank Walls. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.**

D-5 **Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Guidelines:

1. **The preferred solution for parking structures is to incorporate commercial uses at the ground level. Below-grade parking is the next best solution for parking.**
2. **There should be careful consideration of the surrounding street system when locating auto access. When the choice is between an arterial and a lower volume, residential street, access should be placed on the arterial.**
3. **Structured parking façades facing the street and residential areas should be designed and treated to minimize impacts, including sound transmission from inside the parking structure.**

D-6 **Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.**

D-7 **Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.**

D-8 **Treatment of Alleys. The design of alley entrances should enhance the pedestrian street front.**

D-9 **Commercial Signage. Signs should add interest to the street front environment and should be appropriate for the scale and character desired in the area.**

D-10 **Commercial Lighting. Appropriate levels of lighting should be provided in order to promote visual interest and a sense of security for people in commercial districts during evening hours. Lighting may be provided by incorporation into the building façade, the underside of overhead weather protection, on and around street furniture, in merchandising display windows, in landscaped areas, and/or on signage.**

D-11 **Commercial Transparency. Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.**

E-2 **Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.**

E-3 **<u>Landscape Design to Address Special Site Conditions</u>. The landscape design should take advantage of special on-site conditions such as high-bank front yards, steep slopes, view corridors, or existing significant trees and off-site conditions such as greenbelts, ravines, natural areas, and boulevards.**

University-specific supplemental guidance:

Context: The retention of existing, large trees is an important consideration in new construction, particularly on the wooded slopes in the Ravenna Urban Village. The 17th Avenue NE tree-lined boulevard is an important, visually pleasing streetscape.

Guidelines:

1. **Retain existing large trees wherever possible. This is especially important on the wooded slopes in the Ravenna Urban Village.**
2. **The 17th Avenue NE (boulevard) character, with landscaped front yards and uniform street trees, is an important neighborhood feature to be maintained.**

FINAL RECOMMENDATION: September 21, 2015

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project number (3013250) at this website:

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at Seattle DCI:

Mailing Address: **Public Resource Center**
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: PRC@seattle.gov

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Concerned about the proximity of the bus stop to the building entrance in regards to the volume of people waiting and access for residents.
- Concerned about move-in traffic, and the potential impacts on bike traffic.
- Felt that the overall design should be held to a high standard of design, as the site is on a prominent corner and is highly visible.
- Felt that the corner treatment needed further development, and that the massing and design language is not differentiated enough from the rest of the building as to create a strong focal point.
- Supported the idea of a wood framing element, but noted that it does not appear to fit with the rest of the composition.

- Noted that it is unclear how the base meets the alley at the northeast corner, and supported a clean edge with no awkward areas.
- Supported proposed lighting and spaces for active uses along the alley for safety.
- Encouraged lighting to be LEDs, to employ green building strategies.
- Supported the idea of art on the blank wall along NE 50th Street, and encouraged a design that could function as a meeting place.
- Suggested a green wall for the north façade of the base.
- Encouraged landscaping design to prioritize inclusion of native plantings.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS: SEPTEMBER 21, 2015

The Board was very pleased with the proposed design and its progression since the last meeting, and felt that the major concerns raised at EDG had largely been resolved.

The Board appreciated the studies on how the massing and composition were developed and offered further guidance on the following items:

1. **Massing Concept & Corner Element.** The Board noted that the success of the corner element is crucial to the clarity of the massing concept and overall architectural composition. The design of the corner massing requires refinement to establish a strong, dramatic presence at the prominent corner. The Board supported the concept of the framing element, recommending that it needs to be more substantial to read as the focal point of the massing. As proposed, the Board was concerned that the visual weight of the residential bays were overpowering the statement at the corner. The Board made the following recommendations: (CS2-A, CS2-C, CS2-III, CD2-C, CS3-A, PL2-C, DC2-B, DC2-C, DC4-A, DC4-B)
    a. Carry the frame element down the south façade to complete a four-sided "box" and frame the corner. The Board suggested changes in material, or pulling back glazing along the frame element to give the appearance of a deeper canopy.
    b. Increase the thickness of the frame, so that it appear larger and bolder and reads as a more substantial element.
    c. Raise the top of the frame to be at least as high as the massing to the north. In addition, change the color of the parapet at the corner so that it does not detract from the visual prominence of the frame.
    d. The signage proposed at the top of the framing element does not add to the visual prominence and the overall design concept. Remove the sign from this location, and incorporate it into the framing element for higher visibility. The Board suggested incorporating a larger vertical sign on the fin adjacent to the residential entry.
    e. The Board expressed some concern over fading of the composite material, and encouraged the applicant to research potential materials for their ability to resist fading, as well as to develop a maintenance and/or replacement plan if necessary.
    f. The Board noted that the wood composite material on the top of the lower portion of the frame (canopy) would not be visible at street level, and conditioned that the wood composite be carried to the underside.

2. **Entry & Architectural Composition.** The Board supported the concept of the entry as a gap, or interruption, between the corner element and retail bar. The Board agreed, however, that the composition of the many design elements need to be further refined for stronger integration into the overall architectural concept and to establish a coherent composition overall. While the Board supported the recessed entry, they recommended that additional elements be incorporated to make the entry appear more prominent and welcoming. (CS2-B, PL1-B, PL2-B, PL2-C, PL2-D, PL3-A, PL4-C, DC2-B, DC2-C, DC4-B, DC4-C)
    a. The entry should clearly identifiable as an entry. The Board supported the playfulness of the door angle, noting that the interruption in design language helps to identify the entry massing.
    b. The canopy should be large and bold. The Board supported the change in canopy material at the residential entry.
    c. The signage above the entry should be bold and integrated into the overall design concept and entry sequence.
    d. The residential entry should have additional transparency incorporated, to appear more welcoming and increase the visibility of oncoming pedestrian traffic.
    e. Lighting should be brightest at the residential entry to reinforce wayfinding.
    f. The Board noted that the location of the bus stop disrupts the visual connection from the main residential entry to the park, and encouraged the applicant to consider strategies to tie the bus stop in to the overall design of the entry sequence.
    g. The Board supported the gesture of setting back the building to provide additional width for the sidewalk and the public realm, while also creating a generous entry space.
    h. The Board supported the asymmetric location and angled recess of the residential entry, as it provides for a stronger, unbroken retail bar.

3. **Alley.** The Board encouraged the applicant to keep safety and security in mind when refining the design of the alley. (PL2-B, DC4-C)
    a. The Board discouraged horizontal railings, which could be more easily climbed.
    b. Revise the alcove at the maintenance entry to be flush with the adjacent facades, as to improve sightlines and reduce potential security issues.

4. **Signage.** The Board supported the concept for two signs of varying scales: one large sign that is incorporated into the design of the corner element, and one smaller sign as part of the entry sequence. The signs should be consistent in design language, and tie into the overall design concept. (DC4-B)

5. **North Façade.** The north façade base will be visible from the adjacent site, and should feature well-detailed, sealed concrete. If painted, the color should be neutral to act as a backdrop, not a focal point. (CS2-D, DC2-B, DC4-A)

6. **Street-level Façade, Northwest Corner.** The area of the street-facing façade containing the mechanical entry and secondary residential exit-only door should appear consistent with the rest of the retail bar and continue the established design language. (DC2-B, DC4-A)

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

The priority Citywide and Neighborhood guidelines identified by the Board as Priority Guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website

CONTEXT & SITE

CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-1. Corner Sites: Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning: Review the height, bulk, and scale of neighboring buildings as well as the scale of development anticipated by zoning for the area to determine an appropriate complement and/or transition.

CS2-D-5. Respect for Adjacent Sites: Respect adjacent properties with design and site planning to minimize disrupting the privacy of residents in adjacent buildings.

University Supplemental Guidance:

CS2-III Corner Lots

CS2-III-i. Special Site Features: For new buildings located on a corner, including, but not limited to the corner locations identified in Map 3 of the full Guidelines, consider providing special building elements distinguishable from the rest of the building such as a tower, corner articulation or bay windows. Consider a special site feature such as diagonal orientation and entry, a sculpture, a courtyard, or other device. Corner entries should be set back to allow pedestrian flow and good visibility at the intersection.

CS3 Architectural Context and Character: Contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood.

CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

CS3-A-2. Contemporary Design: Explore how contemporary designs can contribute to the development of attractive new forms and architectural styles; as expressed through use of new materials or other means.

PUBLIC LIFE

PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-2. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample space for pedestrian flow and circulation, particularly in areas where there is already heavy pedestrian traffic or where the project is expected to add or attract pedestrians to the area.

PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities: Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

PL2 Walkability: Create a safe and comfortable walking environment that is easy to navigate and well-connected to existing pedestrian walkways and features.

PL2-B Safety and Security

PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street: Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety: Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency: Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

PL2-C Weather Protection

PL2-C-2. Design Integration: Integrate weather protection, gutters and downspouts into the design of the structure as a whole, and ensure that it also relates well to neighboring buildings in design, coverage, or other features.

PL2-D Wayfinding

PL2-D-1. Design as Wayfinding: Use design features as a means of wayfinding wherever possible.

University Supplemental Guidance:

PL2-I Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances

PL2-I-i. Residential Entries: On Mixed Use Corridors, entries to upper floor residential uses should be accessed from, but not dominate, the street frontage. On corner locations, the main residential entry should be on the side street with a small courtyard that provides a transition between the entry and the street.

PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.

PL3-A Entries

PL3-A-1. Design Objectives: Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

PL3-A-2. Common Entries: Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements: Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.

PL4-C Planning Ahead For Transit

PL4-C-1. Influence on Project Design: Identify how a transit stop (planned or built) adjacent to or near the site may influence project design, provide opportunities for placemaking.

DESIGN CONCEPT

DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.

DC2-AMassing

DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses: Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

DC2-BArchitectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs— considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

DC2-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

DC2-CSecondary Architectural Features

DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose— adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

DC2-DScale and Texture

DC2-D-1. Human Scale: Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.

DC3-BOpen Space Uses and Activities

DC3-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space: Site and design project-related open spaces to connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate.

DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.

DC4-AExterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle's climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-B Signage

DC4-B-1. Scale and Character: Add interest to the streetscape with exterior signs and attachments that are appropriate in scale and character to the project and its environs.

DC4-B-2. Coordination with Project Design: Develop a signage plan within the context of architectural and open space concepts, and coordinate the details with façade design, lighting, and other project features to complement the project as a whole, in addition to the surrounding context.

DC4-C Lighting

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure(s).

At the time of the Recommendation meeting, the following departures were requested:

1. **Blank facades. (SMC 23.47A.008.B.2):** The Code requires sixty percent of the street facing façade between 2 and 8 feet above the sidewalk to be transparent. The applicant proposes a reduction of the required transparency of the south façade to 48.8%.

   The Board unanimously recommended approval of the departure. The Board agreed that the grade along NE 50th Street presented challenges with internal programming and providing a consistent and continuous streetscape façade, but was concerned that the proposed spandrel glass treatment would not provide adequate activation and could contribute to security issues. The Board noted that the location of the blank wall presented an opportunity to incorporate a unique art feature, and thus placed a condition on the departure to activate the streetscape and enhance the public realm by incorporating an art piece that wraps around the corner to the alley. (CS2-A, CS2-III, PL1-B, DC2-B, DC2-D)

2. **Rear Setback (SMC 23.47A.014.B.3):** The Code requires a setback along any side or rear lot line that abuts a lot in a residential zone that is across an alley from a lot in a residential zone. The required setback is 15 feet for portions of the structure above 13 feet to a maximum of 40 feet, and an additional 2 feet of setback for every 10 feet by which the height exceeds 40 feet. The applicant proposes a reduction of 2'-4"of the required setback above 13 feet, and a reduction of 2'-0" reduction of the required setback for portions above 60 feet.

The Board unanimously recommended approval of the departure, noting that the entire building has been set back 5 feet from the west property. line to provide additional width for the sidewalk along University Way NE to accommodate pedestrian volumes. The Board agreed that the departure allows for a wider sidewalk along University Way NE that accommodates higher pedestrian volumes and queued bus passengers, enhances the public realm, and responds to the park across the street. (CS2-B, PL1-B, PL4-C, DC3-B)

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

At the conclusion of the Final Recommendation meeting, the Board recommended approval of the project with conditions.

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated September 21, 2015, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the September 21, 2015 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the project design with conditions, listed below.

1. Carry the frame element down the south façade to complete a four-sided "box" to frame the corner.
2. Increase the thickness of the frame, so that it appears larger and bolder, and reads as a more substantial element.
3. Raise the top of the frame to be at least as high as the massing to the north. Change the color of the parapet at the corner so that it does not detract from the visual prominence of the frame.
4. The signage proposed at the top of the framing element does not add to the visual prominence and the overall design concept. Remove the sign from this location, and incorporate it into the framing element for higher visibility.
5. Carry the wood composite material to the underside of the canopy at street level.
6. Revise the eastern portion of the south façade at street-level to incorporate an art feature that wraps the corner to the alley.
7. Revise the lighting scheme to highlight the residential entry.
8. The signage above the residential entry should be bold and be integrated into the overall design concept. (DC4-B)
9. Incorporate additional transparency into the residential entry doors.
10. Revise the recess at the mechanical entry along the alley to be flush with adjacent facades.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the SDCI Director's decision reads in part as follows:

The Director's decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full

substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or
b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or
c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or
d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.

Subject to the following conditions, the design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on September 21, 2015, the Board recommended approval of the project with the conditions described in the summary of the Recommendation meeting above.

Four members of the Northeast Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3).

The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board.

Following the Recommendation meeting, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

Applicant response to Recommended Design Review Condition:

1. The frame element has been continued down the south façade.
2. The thickness of the frame element has been increased 2'-0'.
3. The upper horizontal plane of the frame has been raised to the maximum height allowed, even with the height of the massing to the north. The color of the parapet at the corner, inside the frame, has been revised to be consistent with the framing element.
4. The signage at the top of the frame has been removed.
5. The wood composite material has been applied to the underside of the canopy.
6. An art piece has been proposed on the south façade, and shall wrap the corner to the east at the alley. The art shall be designed to incorporate any mechanical or other features at this location.
7. The design for the canopy at the residential entry has been revised to incorporate wall sconces, downlights, and illuminated signage to highlight the residential entry.
8. The signage has been revised to illuminated letters and has been incorporated into the design of the entry canopy.
9. The wood composite material has been removed at the residential entry, and more transparency has been incorporated.
10. The recess at the mechanical entry along the alley has been revised to be flush with the adjacent façade.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings.

The Director of SDCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendation and will require conditions to satisfy the Board's recommended condition #6.

DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design and Development Standard Departures are **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED** subject to the conditions listed below.

II. ANALYSIS - SEPA

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the Seattle State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 25.05).

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated August 3, 2015[1]. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or it's agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states in part: "*where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation*" subject to some limitations.

City codes and/or ordinances apply to the proposal and will provide mitigation for short and or/long term impacts. Applicable codes may include the following: *Stormwater Code* (SMC 22.800-808); *Grading Code* (SMC 22.170), *Street Use Ordinance* (SMC Title 15), *Seattle Building Code*; *Regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas* (SMC 25.09); and *Noise Control Ordinance* (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. Washington State Department of Ecology regulations require mitigation of significant environmental contamination impacts, consistent with Model Toxics Control Act requirements. Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered.

[1] A SEPA checklist was originally submitted July 12, 2013. An updated SEPA checklist was submitted August 3, 2015.

A. SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinance will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Construction Parking and Traffic

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. The area is subject to significant traffic congestion during peak travel times on nearby arterials. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets would be expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic.

The area includes limited on-street parking. Additional parking demand from construction vehicles would be expected to further exacerbate the supply of on-street parking. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities."

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm.

The site is located in an area of very high pedestrian traffic and is located on two high volume traffic arterials. The traffic and parking analysis[2,3] described transit stops on both adjacent street frontages and an estimated 386 pedestrians per hour at the northeast intersection of NE 50th St and University Way NE. Given the high levels of pedestrian traffic, the high levels of vehicular traffic on both street frontages, and the location on a transit route, a condition is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.B to ensure that sidewalks or pedestrian routes are maintained during construction.

Construction Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. These impacts would be especially adverse in the early morning, in the evening, and on

[2] *Miranda Development Traffic Impact Analysis*, Gibson Traffic Consultants, July 2013.
[3] "Correction Notice Response," Gibson Traffic Consultants, 26 March 2015.

weekends. The Seattle Noise Ordinance permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in Neighborhood Commercial zones. If extended construction hours are desired, the applicant may seek approval from SDCI through a Noise Variance request.

A Construction Management Plan will be required, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance and the CMP are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigation noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

B. LONG –TERM IMPACTS

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: greenhouse gas emissions; parking; possible increased traffic in the area. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, greenhouse gas emissions; historic and cultural preservation; height, bulk and scale; traffic and transportation; and parking impacts warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project construction and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant. Therefore, no further mitigation is warranted.

Parking

The proposed development includes 111 residential units with 41 off-street vehicular parking spaces. The traffic and parking analysis[4,5] indicates a peak demand for a maximum of 65-106 vehicles from the proposed development. Peak residential demand typically occurs overnight.

The proposed development peak demand of 106 parking spaces would not be accommodated by the 41 off-street parking spaces in the development, resulting in a spillover demand of up to 65 on-street parking spaces. The proposal therefore would have a potential impact to on-street parking utilization.

SMC 25.05.675.M notes that there is no SEPA authority provided for mitigation of parking impacts in Urban Centers. This site is located in the University District Urban Center. Regardless of the parking demand impacts, no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate impacts on parking demand from this proposal.

[4] *Miranda Development Traffic Impact Analysis*, Gibson Traffic Consultants, July 2013.
[5] "Correction Notice Response," Gibson Traffic Consultants, 26 March 2015.

Height, Bulk & Scale

The proposal has gone through the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment.

Section 25.05.675.G.2.c of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides the following: "The Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood design guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk, and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process shall be presumed to comply with these Height, Bulk, and Scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk, and scale policies on projects that have undergone Design Review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project."

The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development and relationship to nearby context have been addressed during the Design Review process for any new project proposed on the site. Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

Historic Preservation

The existing structure at 5000-5002 University Way NE is more than 50 years old. The structure was reviewed for potential to meet historic landmark status. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status[6].

The site is across the street from a designated historic landmark (University Heights Community Center). The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and did not recommend changes to the proposed design (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB 482/15).

Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and no further conditioning is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.H.

Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis[7,8] indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 843 daily vehicle trips, with 67 net new PM Peak Hour trips and 41 AM Peak hour trips.

[6] Landmarks Preservation Board letter, LPB 482/15.
[7] *Miranda Development Traffic Impact Analysis,* Gibson Traffic Consultants, July 2013.
[6] "Correction Notice Response*,"* Gibson Traffic Consultants, 26 March 2015.

The additional trips would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. Concurrency analysis was conducted for nearby identified areas. That analysis showed that the project is expected to be well within the adopted standards for the identified areas. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that while these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant; therefore, no further mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

DECISION - STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

☒ Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21.030(2) (c).

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 and Early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

DESIGN REVIEW - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Issuance of MUP

1. Revise the color of the vents to match the field color on which they are located.

Prior to Issuance of Building Permit

2. Show the approximate size and location of proposed public art with a note on the plans that the Land Use Planner shall approve the art prior to fabrication and installation.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

3. The art shall be fabricated and installed as approved by the Land Use Planner (Katy Haima, katy.haima@seattle.gov).

4. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Katy Haima, katy.haima@seattle.gov).

5. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 30-2015, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Katy Haima, katy.haima@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

6. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Katy Haima, katy.haima@seattle.gov).

SEPA - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Issuance of a Demolition, Grading, or Building Permit

7. Provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm.

During Construction

8. The applicant or their contractor will ensure that open and safe pedestrian routes adjacent to the site are maintained in a manner approved by SDOT. A SDOT determination that this requirement is not feasible during a period or periods of construction will temporarily override this Condition.

Katy Haima, Land Use Planner Date: February 16, 2016
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

KH:drm

K\Decisions-Signed\3013250.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance". (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance" on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner's decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered "approved for issuance" following the Council's decision.

The "approved for issuance" date marks the beginning of the **three year life** of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by Seattle DCI within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled. (SMC 23-76-028) (Projects with a shoreline component have a **two year life**. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at prc@seattle.gov or to our message line at 206-684-8467.